

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of December 27, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 4-6, 10 and 15 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-18 and 20 remain in this application. Claim 19 has been canceled. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Perrone *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,603,881, hereinafter “**Perrone**”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

an ink analyzer object that employs the first thread to make a copy of the document data, provides the copy of the document data to an electronic ink analysis process, and returns control of the first processing thread to the software application, *wherein the software application is configured to receive new document data while the electronic ink analysis process is being performed.*

(Emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that **Perrone** fails to teach or suggest such a feature. **Perrone** merely discloses that the data selected for analysis must be analyzed before selecting additional data for analysis. See FIG. 2 of **Perrone**, steps 204 and 208. Notably, **Perrone** fails to discuss when the receipt of new document data takes place. In fact, **Perrone** suggests that new document data cannot be received until the analysis process has been completed for the previously-received data and the results have been displayed. See FIG. 2, step 207. Only after the user selects the additional ink that the user wants processed will the analysis process repeat. See col. 5, line 61 – col. 6, line 16 and also FIG. 2, steps 208 and 202. Thus, **Perrone** fails to teach or suggest the feature of wherein the software application is configured to receive new document data while the electronic ink analysis process is being performed as recited in claim 1. As such, **Perrone** fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is distinguishable from **Perrone**.

Claims 2-3 depend on claim 1 and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and in view of the advantageous features recited therein.

Amended independent claim 4 recites, *inter alia*,

provides the copy of the document data to an electronic ink analysis process, returns control of the first processing thread to the software application, wherein the software application is configured to receive new document data while the electronic ink analysis process is being performed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the distinguishing features of claim 4 are similar to the distinguishing features of claim 1 as discussed above. As such, claim 4 is distinguishable from **Perrone** for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1.

Amended independent claim 5 recites, *inter alia*,

receiving a copy of data of a document, wherein a first processing thread is employed to make the copy of the document data, wherein the copy of the document data includes an analysis context value identifying an analysis context object, and wherein the analysis context object includes a data structure containing characteristic data for one or more elements of the document; in response to receiving the copy of the document data, performing an analysis of the analysis context object, *wherein the first processing thread receives new document data while the analysis of the analysis context object is being performed*; and providing the results of the analysis of the analysis context object.

(Emphasis added.) Applicants respectfully submit that **Perrone** fails to teach or suggest the feature of *wherein the first processing thread receives new document data while the analysis of the analysis context object is being performed* as recited in claim 5 for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. As such, **Perrone** fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 5. Therefore, claim 5 is distinguishable from **Perrone**.

Claims 6-14 ultimately depend on claim 5 and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 5, and in view of the advantageous features recited therein.

Amended claim 15 now incorporates the features of claim 19, and accordingly claim 19 has been canceled. Amended claim 15 recites, *inter alia*,

receiving a call to create an analysis context object corresponding to a document; and, in response to receiving the call to create an analysis context object corresponding to a document, creating an analysis context object that includes a data structure containing characteristic data for one or more elements of a document, and *wherein the analysis context object includes hints for assisting a document analysis process*.

(Emphasis added). The Office Action alleges that **Perrone** suggests the feature of an analysis context object which includes hints for assisting a document analysis process as recited in claim

15. See Office Action, page 7. In particular, the Office Action alleges that such a feature may be found at **Perrone**, Fig. 2, S204 and col. 6, lines 1-16. However, the cited passage merely discusses that the selected ink will be decoded and that recognition results will be produced. Notably, such a discussion fails to teach or suggest the feature of an analysis context object which includes *hints for assisting a document analysis process* as recited in claim 15. In fact, the cited passage and the rest of **Perrone** is devoid of any discussion of an analysis context object which includes *hints for assisting a document analysis process* as recited in claim 15. As such, **Perrone** fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 15. Therefore, amended claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 16-18 and 20 ultimately depend on claim 15 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15, and in further view of the advantageous features recited therein.

### **CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: May 27, 2008

By: /Gary D. Fedorochko/  
Gary D. Fedorochko  
Registration No. 35,509

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001

GDF:RHL:lab